



## NEWS RELEASE

### JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

CONTACT  
LYNN HOLTON  
PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER  
(415)865-7738

RELEASE DATE: November 22, 1999

RELEASE #: S.C. 47/99

### **SUMMARY OF CASES ACCEPTED DURING THE WEEK OF NOVEMBER 15, 1999**

[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The description or descriptions set out below do not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#99-176 People v. Atkins, S082662. (C029002; 74 Cal.App.4th 466.)

Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. This case concerns whether arson is a specific intent crime for purposes of the admission of evidence of voluntary intoxication pursuant to Penal Code section 22.

#99-177 Donovan v. RRL Corp., S082570. (G024997; 74 Cal.App.4th 540.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case concerns whether an automobile dealer is obligated to sell a vehicle at its advertised price when that price is the result of a printing error by the newspaper. (See Veh. Code, § 11713.1(e).)

#99-178 People v. Epps, S082110. (B121438; 73 Cal.App.4th 1332.)

Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses.

(over)

#99-179 People v. Gonzalez, S081855. (B122228; 73 Cal.App.4th 885.)  
Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses.

Epps and Gonzalez present similar issues concerning whether the trial court erred, and if so prejudicially, in denying the defendant's request for a jury trial on prior conviction allegations.

#99-180 People v. Garcia, S081934. (A080076; 73 Cal.App.4th 1099.)  
Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. This case presents issues including whether knowledge of the duty to register is an element of the crime of failure to register as a sex offender. (See Pen. Code, § 290.)